

From: Michael Carr
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 9:54 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership rules - NO CHANGES PLEASE

5/31/03

subject: Broadcast Ownership rules - NO CHANGES PLEASE

Dear FCC Commissioners:

Please make NO CHANGES to the "Broadcast Ownership rules" during your meeting 6/2/03.

Yours in Life,

Michael Carr
2511 Wedglea Dr. #710
Dallas, TX 75211-2042

214-948-8668 day
214-693-2292 voice mail
775-254-3368 fax (but e-mail is best)
michaelcarr@omnitechdesign.com e-mail

From: Sanpilar@copper.net
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 9:59 PM
Subject: Please don't deregulate further

Dear Commissioner Abernathy,

I ask that you please recall your commission's mission statement and consider serving the public and regulating industry rather than the other way around.

Sincerely,
Cheren Meade
Santa Fe, NM

From: Cathy VerHey
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:02 PM
Subject: The Media

Please do not give more control to the large media conglomerates. We need more local stations, not big media giants.

Get more from the Web. FREE MSN Explorer download : <http://explorer.msn.com>

From: Sid Davis
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:05 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Copps, Martin and Adelstein,

I hope it is not too late to seek a delay or to stop the proposal to lift ownership restrictions in broadcasting.

I am a former Vice President and Washington Bureau Chief of NBC News and a former White House Correspondent and Washington Bureau Chief of Westinghouse Broadcasting Company (Group W).

I spent 18 years with Westinghouse through the sixties and seventies. We owned the limit of stations then, five TV and seven radio. We had a Washington news bureau staff of seventeen, a bureau chief, a deputy, seven correspondents, a commentator, three techs, and two clerical people. We had a multiple person news center in London and bureaus in Rome, Paris, Saigon, Vienna, and stringers in Moscow, Tokyo and elsewhere. We had 24 hour circuits to our stations. We covered all important presidential speeches and news conferences live. That was policy. Each of our stations had large local news departments. We did all that with only five TV's and seven radios! And we made good money too.

I would venture a guess that few, if any, of the mammoth radio conglomerates today, some with hundreds, even as many as 1200 stations, has its own news bureau in Washington and elsewhere. Most don't have meaningful local news departments. These giants operate on the "rent a reporter" principle because it is cheap. They are, in effect, outsourcing responsibility. This is not diversity. It is a flagrant trashing of obligations once held dear by responsible broadcasters who pledged to serve the public interest, convenience and necessity, in return for a license. Since the flood gates of ownership were opened in 1996, radio and television quality has not improved. Radio has become a cacophonous, open drainage ditch, broadcasting only what can sell. That is not the use Americans and the broadcasting pioneers expected from an industry with such great potential to inform and educate.

The concentration of media power in a handful of owners will further limit what we see and hear because the conglomerates are cheaping out on news. "The public interest, convenience and necessity" is a rarely heard expression in those quarters. Local broadcasting is being swallowed by the bargain basement economics of centrally dictated programming. Americans will be sorted out into One Company Media Towns hooked to a program director in a distant place who knows nothing of the local culture or its problems. We Americans used to brag about having news media that were not controlled by the hands of a few. We once considered that dangerous, incompatible with democracy. Removing the ownership restrictions surely will make money. But it has not and will not make broadcasting better. It is bad news. It's wrong.

Sincerely,

Sid Davis

From: Larry Pate
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:05 PM
Subject: proposed rules change

Dear Mr. Powell,

I
request that the FCC not loosen the rules on how many newspapers and broadcast stations a company can own in the same market. The present prohibition helps to preserve a variety of viewpoints. The prospect of fewer owners controlling more communication outlets is troubling and the result will be fewer public voices. Sincerely, LMPate

Tired of spam? Get advanced junk mail protection with MSN 8.
<http://join.msn.com/?page=features/junkmail>

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein,
Impate@hotmail.com

From: Jack & Joyce Stufflebeem
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:09 PM
Subject: local radio

We urge you not to allow broadcasting companies to have control of local radio stations. Local stations should be able to control what they broadcast.

Jack Stufflebeem

From: Mark Hawthorne
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:11 PM
Subject: Adoption of Rules Chnages

The Honorable Kathleen Q. Abernathy, Commissioner

On June 2nd, the FCC will take its final vote on whether or not to change current "Broadcast Ownership Rules," and allow giant media conglomerates to grab an even bigger share of television and radio stations across our nation.

If these rule changes are adopted, it could give a tiny handful of anti-gun media executives the unchallenged power to keep NRA viewpoints off the T.V. and radio airwaves in thousands of communities across our nation -- small towns and big cities alike. The big media conglomerates have proved in the past that they WILL use their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air and these proposed rule changes would extend that power even further.

- If proposed "broadcast ownership rules" are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States could be snuffed out by huge media corporations.

- Whole communities and even whole states and regions could be dominated by media companies that would have the power to decide which viewpoints to allow on the air and which to censor.

- The FCC, controlled by five unelected officials, has conducted its decision-making process with only one public hearing and very little time for the public to react.

- Many of the corporations fighting for these rule changes -- including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC -- demonstrate a strong anti-gun bias in their news coverage and programming.

Our nation was founded on a set of rights, the first one being the right of free speech. Adoption of the proposed changes would in essence squelch the free speech rights of individuals and organizations alike by providing anti-gun media executives the authority to censor other's viewpoints. Therefore, I respectfully ask that you vote against the proposed rule changes.
Thanks you for your time.

Mark Hawthorne
Azle, TX

From: Stan Fee
To: Mike Powell, j.adelste@fcc.gov, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB,
FCC FCCINFO
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:24 PM
Subject: media %

If you were watching more TV and reading more papers rather than listening to people with agendas you would know more of what is going on. Someone/group appears to be trying to control the minds of the United States citizens.

Is the upping of the percent of ownership in a market for the purpose of making money? or for the purpose of controlling peoples minds? There is no way it can be for better news and information or in the interest of the Constitution of the United States which you have sworn to uphold.

Stan Fee sfee@hiwaay.net

From: CAROLYN DEVINE
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:31 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules Change

I don't think it is in the public interest to allow media monopolies. Please delay your vote on this proposal, provide public hearings in various cities and give the public the opportunity to address this very important issue. Thank you very much.

Carolyn Devine, 415.922.5298

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Timothy Rule
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:31 PM
Subject: Your vote on Monday, June 2--NO!

Hi -

I wish to express my opposition to allowing megacorporations even more control over media. We do not need more PASTEURIZED, PROCESSED, INFORMATION PRODUCT. The claim that there are ever more sources, the internet, cable, etc. is false and misleading. Many of us do not have, and do not want, cable. You've heard all the arguments-the vast majority of news and other information is disseminated through 'traditional' broadcast channels.

Please support freedom of choice and information. Vote against this bill.

Thank you

Tim

Timothy C. Rule
2918 Cresmont Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21211

email: trule@toad.net

From: Gmpduncan@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:41 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Subject: ownership rules

Please do not relax the current ownership rules which prevent monopolies. The proposed changes pave the way for media conglomerates to gain near total control of broadcast news and information across the country.

Consider how many of them also own publishing interests and retail book outlets.

Please don't give them the power to limit different view points by keeping them off the air. We need opposing view points.

Many corporations now lobbying the FCC to relax ownership rules have a known record in trying to keep opposing views off the air.

PLEASE continue the broadcast ownership protections which have helped our country to have an informed public so crucial to healthy political debate which keeps our democracy alive.

Thank you.

G. M. Duncan

From: Mark Gilman
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjmweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 10:59 PM
Subject: MM Docket 01-235 and MM Docket 01-317

Federal Communication Commission

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am very concerned about issues the FCC will be voting on, on Monday June 2, 2003, especially those rules dealing with the Cross Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers (MM Docket No. 01-235) and Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets (MM Docket No. 01-317).

I believe that if you approve Cross Ownership and Multiple Ownership, that will lead to further consolidation of what news Americans will be exposed to.

In a democracy, the people should have access to many diverse sources of information. The trend toward consolidation, in my opinion, is very restrictive and contrary to the rights and freedoms guaranteed to the American people by our constitution. Also, because of limited access to information that already exists, I believe there has not been sufficient public education about these issues, nor has there been sufficient opportunity for public input.

- 1) Please delay your vote on these very important issues for at least one month.
- 2) Please do not allow further consolidation of the media. I do not think Cross Ownership or Multiple Ownership will promote either competition or diversity.
- 3) Please remember who you are suppose to represent, the American People.

Sincerely,

Liz Wirth
551 W. Cordova Road
Santa Fe, NM 87505

From: Art Garland Sr
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:12 PM
Subject: Consolidation of Broadcast Ownership

Dear Ms. Abernathy:

The proposal to voted Monday, to allow even more consolidation of broadcast ownership is a very, very bad idea.

Currently we have ownership of many stations in many markets by the same one or two Corporations and often the content is from a single source distributed via satellite and one cannot even contact anyone local when emergencies arise.

Please, reduce the number of media outlets that one entity can own in any local market--DO NOT INCREASE THEM.

Sincerely,

A W Garland Sr
297 Lakeshore Dr
Warner Robins GA 31088

From: halverson
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:14 PM
Subject: DON'T RELAX RULES!

Dear Ms. Abernathy,

I strongly urge you not to relax the ownership rules. Big media conglomerates have in the past used their power to keep opposing views off the air. Americans deserve more than one viewpoint on important issues.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alan Halverson
Santa Cruz, CA

From: Mckinneyhunter@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:22 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Please consider the people that work within the broadcasting industry when you make your decisions. Please don't sell the FCC to big business. They are greedy, and do not care about people, not even their own people.

From: Mckinneyhunter@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:22 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Please consider the people that work within the broadcasting industry when you make your decisions.
Please don't sell the FCC to big business. They are greedy, and do not care about people, not even their own people.

From: LUKTREV@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:32 PM
Subject: Vote NO on June 2nd

Please consider seriously your vote on June 2nd, and do not restrict the right of Americans to have diversity in it's media sources. Do NOT vote for consolidation of the media.

Yours truly,

Paul and Karyn Schmitt
Luke Schmitt

From: Dennis Runyan
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:35 PM
Subject: Relaxation of broadcast ownership rules

Dear Ms Abernathy

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely

Mr. Dennis E. Runyan
New Whiteland, Indiana 46184-1470

From: Michel Campbell
To: Kathleen Abernathy, jadelst@fcc.gov, KM KJMWEB
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:37 PM
Subject: Withhold Changes to Media Ownership Rules

As a citizen concerned that FCC rules should continue to protect the Public Interest, especially the Public's right to receive information from the widest possible range of press and media sources, I am writing to urge you and the other Commissioners as strongly as I can to vote NO to the proposed sweeping changes scheduled for a vote on June 2 which would further relax media ownership rules, allowing even concentration of ownership of media in particular localities than already exists.

I believe this would be bad for the Public Interest, because there are already many communities where almost all the broadcast media come from two or three big corporations operating from afar, and the proposed changes are sure to make things worse, both directly, by allowing bigger sections and more kinds of media in a local market to belong to one owner, and indirectly (and perhaps even more unfortunately in the long term) because the new round of mergers and takeovers almost sure to follow such a change will eliminate many of the smaller and medium-sized media companies that still survive under current rules, leaving little choice at community level of sources for either information or entertainment from the outside world.

There is also another danger in further concentration of media, which has received little or no attention. Since terrorism has become a possibility always to be reckoned with, and especially the possibility of sabotage by hackers to the computerized control systems by which large entities operate, it is now the case that every further concentration of control, communications control in particular, increases vulnerability to terrorism by increasing the scope of what a successful terrorist hit could take out. At this juncture we should be decreasing, not increasing, the concentration of communications networks, in order to make our communications structure as little vulnerable to malicious attacks as may be possible.

Amy Louise Campbell (registered voter in Spokane Co.,WA)

(writing from a relative's e-mail address)

From: Leif Jenssen
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:37 PM
Subject: Media ownership at June 2nd meeting

Dear Madam:

I would urge you to vote against the proposed relaxation of the media ownership rules that comes up at the June 2nd meeting. Such a significant issue should require more study and public input, in my opinion.

Very truly yours,

Leif Jenssen, Atty at Law
El Cerrito, CA

From: Ralph & Pam
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:40 PM
Subject: Please read

Before you vote on June 2nd to loosen media ownership rules, please take a moment to consider what effect such a move will have on program content.

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. - They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

Further deregulation will not mean greater opportunity for competition. Rather, it will mean the opposite: More control of the airwaves by the few, with even less accountability to the market than they demonstrate today.

The concept of community standards is alien to the suits in New York. Their bottom-line programming philosophy means bottom-of-the-barrel programming, and quality be hanged.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a hand-full of major conglomerates. Please do not relax the media ownership rules.

Ralph & Pam Seghetti

From: Deekurowski@cs.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:48 PM
Subject: Re Monday's vote

I understand that you will be voting on whether to give more ownership of media space to the companies that you should be regulating. Please consider carefully.

Free press is a joke when there is a concentration of ownership in the news media. If the FCC can't do what it is in existence to do, then maybe we should save the money it costs us, and abolish it. You are supposed to be working for the people - not the companies you are hired to regulate. Thank you,

Martha and John Kurowski

From: OSCAR FAIR
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 31, 2003 11:49 PM
Subject: FCC Rules

Relaxing the rules on cross-ownership of media outlets will not promote an informed populace in our democracy. In my own city, many of the commercial radio stations are now controlled by one corporation. The result is an over-abundance of vitriolic diatribe mostly directed at "liberals." I enjoy listening to information radio and, if it were not for public radio, I'd be hard-pressed to find true information on my radio with any semblance of objectivity. The FCC should not abandon its historic interest in promoting diversity on the free airwaves in this country.

Marjorie Fair
Louisville, KY

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: megd1@hotmail.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Tue, Jun 3, 2003 9:17 PM
Subject: Please Act to Stop Media Monopolies

Senator John McCain
U.S. Senate
241 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator McCain,

I urge you to tell the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) not to weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of America's newspapers and radio and TV stations.

As you know, the FCC is reviewing rules currently for media ownership and is likely to allow big corporations to dominate ownership of media in a particular city or town. If that happens, one company may be allowed to own the local newspaper, several TV and radio stations and the cable TV system in the same community. There would be fewer owners of networks, stations and newspapers nationwide.

Media ownership would be concentrated among fewer companies and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints would be compromised. Plus, it likely would result in higher costs for businesses that advertise in local media, and those costs likely would be passed onto consumers.

The FCC is expected to vote on whether to change the rules on June 2. The public comments submitted to the FCC by individuals have been opposed to media consolidation overwhelmingly. Americans understand that the public interest is not being served by deregulation that reduces competition.

Please tell the FCC to reinstate its traditional media ownership rules for the sake of competition and democracy.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

carl meggett
3032A Hero Ave
El Paso, Texas 79904

cc: